

Lais, and one can only wonder why she chose not to include it in her selected bibliography. Such problems suggest a certain carelessness on the part of the author and editor.

At first glance, readers, especially those who know the original text, may be dismayed to see that Gilbert has chosen to translate Marie's rhymed octosyllabic works into rhymed couplets in iambic tetrameter, which Donka Minkova describes in her recent book, *A Historical Phonology of English* (Edinburgh, 2013), as "the preferred model for nursery rhymes" and a "type of meter that can easily lapse into monotony" (356). However, Gilbert uses her considerable skills as a practicing poet and what she describes as "modern rhyming practice in English," including the frequent use of half rhyme and slant rhyme, to avoid such pitfalls. As I read the translation, I was pleasantly surprised at how well she succeeds and how accurate most of the lines are, in spite of the efforts to rhyme. She is not always dogmatic about the rhyme and rarely sacrifices meaning to rhyme, which occasionally results in couplets like "He called to him his constable, / ordered that he should quickly go" ("Eliduc," lines 127–28, p. 149) and "He was dragged in the house. He saw / many torments, all horrible" (*Espurgatoire*, lines 1187–88, p. 218). Few have sought to translate Marie's works by recreating, in English, not only her meaning, but also both her meter and rhyme. In my view, Dorothy Gilbert has done it as well and as gracefully as possible.

Overall, the text fits the criteria for the Norton Critical Editions, which are prepared for undergraduate readers and include annotated texts, contexts, and criticism, and I suspect it will be welcomed in English classrooms, especially since it contains portions of three of Marie's works rather than just one. The book is also reasonably priced to suit student budgets. Whether it will supersede some of the earlier fine translations (prose or unrhymed verse) of individual works by well-known scholars of Marie de France (e.g., Burgess and Busby, Joan Ferrante and Robert Hanning) remains to be seen.

JUNE HALL MCCASH, Middle Tennessee State University

WARREN GINSBERG, *Tellers, Tales, and Translation in Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2015. Pp. ix, 250. \$100. ISBN: 978-0-19-874878-6.

doi:10.1086/693550

Translation, a term no longer restricted to interlingual transfer, has become a capacious explanation in literary and cultural studies. Lively current debates engage the dynamics of cosmopolitan and vernacular, local and transnational. Most broadly, Alison Cornish suggests, all human understanding can be conceived as involving translation of the world outside the self (*Vernacular Translation in Dante's Italy*, 2010). Imbricated in the understanding of perception, memory, and poesis, translation seems ideally suited to understanding medieval culture. *Translatio*, after all, referred to metaphor as well as to the transmigration of political legitimacy (*translatio imperii*) and knowledge (*translatio studii*).

Like Ginsberg's *Chaucer's Italian Tradition* (2002), this book uses Walter Benjamin's concept of translation, which here grounds an investigation of intralingual conversation among parts of a single work. "Benjamin-like translation" (17) governs the relation among portraits, tales, and interactive links, so that "one part of the text says what another says but says it differently" (18). Several chapters take up recurrent ideas: interruption, most resonantly when the Franklin interrupts the Squire and recasts rudeness as politeness; reticence and revision, when the Merchant restages elements of the Clerk, his tale, and his envoi; and repetition, when the Miller and his characters unexpectedly resemble one another. Moreover, Absolon's misdirected kiss and his revenge, carried out with hammers, anvils, and hot poker, translates the antihomosexuality of *De planctu Naturae*. Embracing Benjamin's propo-

Speculum 92/4 (October 2017)

sition that isolated words are the proper units for studying translation, this analysis shows how elements of Nature's metaphor for procreation reappear in the Miller's ironic send-up of both aristocratic romance and heteronormative gender assumptions.

Intralingual translation does not preclude the interlingual variety, with two chapters on models of translation from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Dante's *Purgatorio*, and Boccaccio's *Teseida* and *Il Filostrato* (the *Filocolo* also figures importantly with the Franklin). Daphne's metamorphosis models Chaucer's ironic skepticism, whereas Statius's translation of the Virgilian "sacra auri fames" (cursed hunger for gold) as "sacra fame / de l'oro" (sacred hunger for gold) represents religious conversion as linguistic translation. The familiar pairing of irony and allegory here locates the tension between holiday and holy day in Chaucer's poetic reading. The *Purgatorio*'s great discourse on love is translated in Fragment 1, a parallel that seems apt—yes, Chaucer too rings the changes on natural and voluntary love, well- and misdirected—but also imposed, reasonable but not necessary. Here the traditional criteria of source study—direct use of or response to the specific text at hand—are not dispositive for identifying translation. (Thus Ginsberg also asserts that although no evidence proves that Chaucer read the *Decameron*, the *Canterbury Tales* and the *Decameron* nonetheless translate one another, 226.)

Three figures exemplify Chaucer's translations: Chauntecleer, his best translator (17); the Wife of Bath, his best translation (144); and the Pardoner, the most fundamental challenge to his poetic project (203). Chauntecleer's wonderfully true/misguided translation of "mulier hominis est confusio" as "Womman is mannes joye and al his blis" captures both the lack of priority accorded the original and the double vision promoted by Benjaminian translation. The "Nun's Priest's Tale," a satire on the misuses of learning, regularly makes fools of its learned interpreters. Not here: with open-eyed generosity, Ginsberg uses traditional philological tools to join interlingual translation—Latin to English—to intralingual "Benjamin-like translation," in which both positions (concerning an idea translated repeatedly in the work) coexist without endorsement, challenging the reader with the contingent truth of each.

The "Wife of Bath's Tale" reprises the teller's biography in a different key: the Loathly Lady translates the Wife; the list of female desires translates both her advice to wise women and Jankyn's book; and the story of Midas translates her revenge against her fourth husband, whose secrets she aired in public. Some consideration of her interlingual translation of Nature and Genius's colloquy on this subject from the *Roman de la rose* might have amplified the illuminating discussion here. The Wife's lament on her lost youth—with plangent insight into the traumatic experience of a young girl trafficked to old men—becomes the key to her translations. The translational logic—textual parts as *Goldberg Variations* reprising the same thematic material in different modes, time signatures, and keys—often prompts insights into the connections between apparently disparate sections, for instance the Wife's early trauma and the swift disappearance of the raped maiden in her tale.

Finally, the Pardoner translates transubstantiation in ways both firmly anchored in his particular time and place, and impossible to anticipate within them. Because Chaucer thought about the Eucharist not as a Wycliffite or orthodox controversialist, but as a poet thinking about metaphor—*translatio*—the Pardoner challenges the whole Canterbury project, indeed poetic discourse itself. Proposing allegories of identity, then hollowing them out from within, he translates transubstantiation and the pilgrimage—as game and religious discipline—into a key that sabotages both belief and poetic discourse. He is Chaucer's most lethal exposure of his own poetic practice.

This book's deeply informed analyses regularly reward the reader with their fresh insights and the re-visioning of familiar connections under the new sign of translation. What difference does this make? A profound one: it fuses aspects of Chaucer's poetic enterprise that are rarely considered together. Against the backdrop of Chaucer's trilingual London—at a time and place where translation was both a social given and a habit of mind, and where the com-

munity was riven by religious controversy—this study joins Chaucer’s interlingual translations with the internal structural logic of the *Canterbury Tales* as the reclothing of recurrent central ideas in a colorful array of vestments. *Tellers, Tales, and Translation* attests to the generous wisdom, born of “l lungo studio e l grande amore,” that Ginsberg brings to the poet he reads here.

KARLA TAYLOR, University of Michigan

MARIA FABRICIUS HANSEN, *The Spolia Churches of Rome: Recycling Antiquity in the Middle Ages*, trans. BARBARA J. HAVELAND. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2015. Pp. 255; many color and black-and-white figures. \$34.95. ISBN: 978-87-7124-210-2.

doi:10.1086/693752

Some years ago, early on a Sunday morning in an out-of-the-way piazza in Rome, I was standing in front of a medieval doorway photographing its ancient marble frame when a group of German tourists came by. To my astonishment, their guide pointed out “spolia,” and they all duly observed the door frame before marching on. *The Spolia Churches of Rome* was written for tourists like these, inclined to “get off the beaten track” and walk, ride the bus, or cycle to early Christian and medieval churches where they will find “fascinating and instantly appealing, not to say downright entertaining” assemblages of *spolia* in the colonnades (10). It is a guidebook with three parts: an overview of the Christian use of *spolia* (“Recycling Antiquity,” 9–83); a catalog of eleven “Selected *Spolia* Churches” that readers are encouraged to visit (84–217); and “Practical Information,” including a list of other “*spolia* churches,” a timeline, and a glossary (218–46). The book is profusely and beautifully illustrated with mostly original photos, many by the excellent photographer Pernille Klemp. Though not in itself a scholarly work, unlike most guidebooks it is deeply informed by scholarship, especially the author’s own.

The Spolia Churches of Rome is an abridged and reorganized version of the same author’s substantial monograph of 2003, *The Eloquence of Appropriation*, subtitled *Prolegomena to an Understanding of Spolia in Early Christian Rome* (Rome, 2003). The apparatus has been suppressed—there are no footnotes and only the most cursory bibliography in the guidebook—along with the extensive quotations from patristic sources, the comparisons with rhetoric and mnemonics, and the methodological reflections that make *The Eloquence of Appropriation* a notable if slightly controversial contribution. Hansen’s thesis is that the spoliated colonnades of Roman churches represent a new architectural style that expressed an equally new, distinctively Christian worldview (*weltanschauung*). “Anti-naturalistic and metaphorical” (*Eloquence*, 38), abstract and anticorporeal, this worldview both rejected and embraced the legacy of the ordered and rational Roman past. The style of its architectural manifestation can be understood by analogy with rhetoric, that is, by examining written sources ranging from Eusebius’s *Life of Constantine* to Hrabanus Maurus’s *De rerum naturis*, especially the writings of Augustine of Hippo. The construct of the worldview frees the interpreter from any need to demonstrate that the mental habits perceived in these elite texts were shared by less educated strata of society, since worldview is a mental framework “independent of the conscious knowledge and degree of learning of individuals” (38). Thus masons and philosophers could share the appreciation of colonnades comprising heterogeneous capitals, bases, and shafts as pleasing in their variety; as signs of a “programmatic break” (184) with Roman tradition; as manifestations of the Christian license to pick out and reuse what was valuable in pagan culture; as symbolic of the heavenly Church, of the relation between the Old and New Testaments, and of the possibility and process of conversion.

In the absence of Hansen’s original methodological asides, the interpretations of *The Eloquence of Appropriation* reappear in *The Spolia Churches of Rome* as simple fact. All guide-